

APPLICANT(S): BEN-DAVID, Ilan et al.

SERIAL NO.: 10/588,755

FILED: August 8, 2006

Page 10

#### **REMARKS**

The present response is intended to be fully responsive to all points of objection and/or rejection raised by the Examiner and is believed to place the application in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the application is respectfully requested.

Applicants assert that the present invention is new, non-obvious and useful. Prompt consideration and allowance of the claims is respectfully requested.

#### **Status of Claims**

Claims **1, 5-18, 21-32, 36** and **38-40** are pending.

Claims **1, 5-18, 21-32, 36** and **38-40** have been rejected.

Claims **1, 11, and 17** have been amended in this submission. Applicants respectfully assert that the amendments to the claims add no new matter.

*It will be noted that these amendments are made for purposes of clarification only, and therefore, do not require further search. Accordingly, such amendments are appropriate after final Office action, as placing the application for appeal.*

#### **Claim Objections**

In the Office Action, the Examiner objected to claims 1 and 17 for being unclear based on the “thereby allowing...” clause. This clause has now been omitted. It is respectfully submitted that based on the Office action (p. 2, para. 2), the Examiner has understood the scope of the claim without reference to the “thereby allowing...” clause. Accordingly, the amendment does not change the scope of the claim, and is appropriate after final rejection.

In the Office Action, the Examiner objected to claim 11 for lack of antecedent basis. The claim has been amended to correct the informality.

APPLICANT(S): BEN-DAVID, Ilan et al.  
SERIAL NO.: 10/588,755  
FILED: August 8, 2006  
Page 11

## **CLAIM REJECTIONS**

### **35 U.S.C. § 102 Rejections**

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 10, 13, 14, 17, 26, 28, and 29 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e), as being anticipated by U.S. Pat. No. 6,897,876 (Murdoch). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection for at least the below reasons.

As discussed in previous responses, claim 1 recites that the second converter is for “converting said intermediate sub-pixel data into said converted sub-pixel data using at least one conversion matrix, wherein the converted sub-pixel data depends on the intermediate sub-pixel data and a position of the pixel displaying the data, wherein data for each of said four or more primary colors of said converted sub-pixel data is in gray-level format.”

With respect to this claim element, the Examiner has now cited Murdoch, col. 11, lines 17-32, and col. 6, line 25 to col. 7, line 40. Applicants have thoroughly reviewed the newly cited Murdoch reference, and respectfully assert that the Murdoch reference does not disclose this claim element. Specifically, these portions of the Murdoch reference merely discuss color conversion; indeed, it is clear that the conversion is performed identically regardless of the location of the pixel on the display. Therefore, nothing in the Murdoch reference discloses that “the converted sub-pixel data depends on the intermediate sub-pixel data and a position of the pixel displaying the data” as recited in claim 1, i.e., a conversion that may obtain for the same input data different values based on different locations in the display.

Claim 17, which includes similar language, is allowable over the Murdoch reference for similar reasons. Accordingly, claims 1, 10, 13, 14, 17, 26, 28, and 29 are allowable over the Murdoch reference.

### **35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejections**

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 6, 7, 12, 22, and 23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 6,897,876 (Murdoch) in view of U.S. Pat. No. 5,563,725 (Kumada).

APPLICANT(S): BEN-DAVID, Ilan et al.

SERIAL NO.: 10/588,755

FILED: August 8, 2006

Page 12

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 9 and 25 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 6,897,876 (Murdoch) in view of U.S. Pat. No. 5,896,178 (Inoue).

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 11, 15, 16, 17, 18, 27, 30, 32, 36, and 38-40 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 6,897,876 (Murdoch) in view of U.S. Pat. No. 7,365,722 (Lee).

None of the Kumada, Inoue, and Lee references rectify the deficiencies of the Murdoch reference, discussed hereinabove. Accordingly, the rejected dependent claims are allowable, at least for depending from allowable base claims.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants assert that the pending claims are allowable. Their favorable reconsideration and allowance is respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner have any question or comment as to the form, content or entry of this Amendment, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number below. Similarly, if there are any further issues yet to be resolved to advance the prosecution of this application to issue, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned counsel.

Please charge any fees associated with this paper to deposit account No. 50-3355.

Respectfully submitted,

/Guy Yonay/

Guy Yonay

Attorney/Agent for Applicants

Registration No. 52,388

Dated: September 7, 2011

**Pearl Cohen Zedek Latzer, LLP**

1500 Broadway, 12th Floor

New York, New York 10036

Tel: (646) 878-0800

Fax: (646) 878-0801